



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

09/839,495

04/23/2001

Kiyoshi Matsutani

Q63352

2595

65565 7590 02/10/2009
SUGHRUE-265550
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVE. NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

BORLINGHAUS, JASON M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3693

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/10/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 09/839,495 | Applicant(s) MATSUTANI, KIYOSHI | |
| | Examiner JASON M. BORLINGHAUS | Art Unit 3693 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) JASON M. BORLINGHAUS. (3) DIALLO CRENSHAW.

(2) _____. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: _____.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 3 and 15.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner Borlinghaus and Diallo Crenshaw, attorney for applicant, discussed the outstanding 112, 2nd paragraph, rejections from the non-final rejection mailed on 11/12/08. Mr. Crenshaw explained differences in the claim language utilized in the claims to counter the 112, 2nd paragraph, rejections. Despite the explanation, Examiner Borlinghaus suggested that claim language be amended to make the minor difference in claim language more apparent.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

| | |
|--|--|
| /Jason M Borlinghaus/ Examiner, Art Unit 3693 | |
|--|--|